

VZCZCXRO8094
PP RUEHFK RUEHKSO RUEHNAG RUEHNH
DE RUEHKO #2233/01 1370831
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 170831Z MAY 07
FM AMEMBASSY TOKYO
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3688
INFO RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHAAA/THE WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RUEAWJA/USDOJ WASHDC PRIORITY
RULSDMK/USDOT WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDOG/USDOC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC//J5//
RHHMUNA/HQ USPACOM HONOLULU HI
RHHMHBA/COMPACFLT PEARL HARBOR HI
RHMFIUU/HQ PACAF HICKAM AFB HI//CC/PA//
RUALSFJ/COMUSJAPAN YOKOTA AB JA//J5/JO21//
RUYNAAAC/COMNAVFORJAPAN YOKOSUKA JA
RUAYJAA/CTF 72
RUEHNH/AMCONSUL NAHA 3558
RUEHFK/AMCONSUL FUKUOKA 1123
RUEHOK/AMCONSUL OSAKA KOBE 4681
RUEHNAG/AMCONSUL NAGOYA 0359
RUEHKSO/AMCONSUL SAPPORO 2013
RUEHBJ/AMEMBASSY BEIJING 7042
RUEHUL/AMEMBASSY SEOUL 3108
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 4283

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 10 TOKYO 002233

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR E, P, EB, EAP/J, EAP/P, EAP/PD, PA
WHITE HOUSE/NSC/NEC; JUSTICE FOR STU CHEMTOB IN ANTI-TRUST DIVISION;
TREASURY/OASIA/IMI/JAPAN; DEPT PASS USTR/PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE;
SECDEF FOR JCS-J-5/JAPAN,
DASD/ISA/EAPR/JAPAN; DEPT PASS ELECTRONICALLY TO USDA
FAS/ITP FOR SCHROETER; PACOM HONOLULU FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY ADVISOR;
CINCPAC FLT/PA/ COMNAVFORJAPAN/PA.

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [OIIP](#) [KMDR](#) [KPAO](#) [PGOV](#) [PINR](#) [ECON](#) [ELAB](#) [JA](#)
SUBJECT: DAILY SUMMARY OF JAPANESE PRESS 05/17/07

INDEX:

- (1) Panel on Asia gateway concept stops short of listing drastic air-liberalization measures in final report
- (2) Interview with National Defense Academy Professor Emeritus Masamori Sase on the right to collective self-defense
- (3) Laughing at constitutional protectionists' strange logic
- (4) Feature: Prime Minister Abe's words and action regarding the issue of his providing offering to Yasukuni Shrine
- (5) One year after Japan-US agreement on Futenma relocation plan
- (6) Japan being downgraded with 29-year-old woman named director for Asian Affairs at White House NSC

ARTICLES:

- (1) Panel on Asia gateway concept stops short of listing drastic air-liberalization measures in final report

NIHON KEIZAI (Page 3) (Full)
May 17, 2007

The government's Council on Asia Gateway Strategies issued a final report yesterday that proposed turning Haneda Airport into an international airport at an early date, with the aim of making Japan Asia's gateway. The report, though some progress is observed in it,

stopped short of addressing fundamental issues that could undermine Japan's competitiveness, such as the shortage of capacity at airports in the capital sphere, listing only small-scale open skies measures.

Haneda Airport will have its fourth runway in the fall, 2010. The strategic panel had initially called for initiating regular international flight services from and to Haneda even before the completion of the runway, but the panel decided to propose expanding chartered international flights by making use of the current landing and departure slots during early morning and nighttime hours.

Regarding regular international flights to be operated starting in the fall, 2010, the panel agreed to take into consideration such factors as distance, demand, and the importance of routes. It paved the way for the flight course between Haneda and Beijing to be set. This route is longer than the longest domestic route of 1,947 kilometers between Haneda and Ishigaki Island. For regular flights to Europe and the US, only Narita Airport is likely to be used. The report thus avoided reviewing the current framework of using Narita for international flights and Haneda for domestic ones.

Japan Air Lines plans to increase the number of chartered international flights departing from Haneda Airport to 300 this fiscal year, up about 70% over the previous year. All Nippon Airways (ANA) President Mineo Yamamoto also said: "We would like to offer services in a positive manner." The two companies are paying attention to how many landing and take-off slots will be allocated in the fall, 2010. As an ANA executive said, "There will be no change in our business plan for this fiscal year," cool views are dominant in the aviation industry.

(2) Interview with National Defense Academy Professor Emeritus

TOKYO 00002233 002 OF 010

Masamori Sase on the right to collective self-defense

ASAHI (Page 4) (Abridged slightly)
May 17, 2007

-- The government does not allow exercising the right to collective self-defense.

Sase: The government's interpretation that the country has the right under international law but is not allowed to exercise it under its Constitution is defect. It is also a lie that the government cannot easily change the Cabinet Legislation Bureau's traditional theory. In Diet deliberations in 1960, then Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi replied: "Although Japan cannot exercise the collective defense right in a way to conduct core activities in the US mainland, it can exercise it in other parts." The wrong interpretation was established during the Cold War era of the 1980s, and it has run into cul-de-sac without any political decision.

-- In your view, what prevented politics from making a decision?

Sase: I recently asked former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, "Why didn't you say, 'I will make a decision' when you were prime minister?" In response, he said, 'Opening the door for exercising the right would have shorten the life of my administration. (As prime minister), I had to think of the survival of the administration."

-- Do you think Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has decided to cut into the right?

Sase: I don't know. I think he wants to make a decision to exercise it to some extent. But in view of such possibilities as the submission of a resignation by the Cabinet Legislation Office chief and turmoil in his administration, I don't know if he can stick to his conviction.

-- Even some ruling coalition members are already voicing apprehensions about the future course of the blue-ribbon panel you are going to join.

Sase: What I want to say is that being able to exercise the right under the Constitution and brandishing it are two different matters. Once a conclusion is reached to allow using it, we need to place substantially tight restrictions on it.

-- Specifically what kind of restrictions?

Sase: Perhaps a government statement - in a form similar to the three non-nuclear principles. A statement reading "Decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis in view of national interests and the situation at the time" would not cause other countries to harbor doubts. In that event, specific cases must not be mentioned because cases expected to require using the right would change with times.

-- But isn't the panel going to discuss specific cases?

Sase: Honestly speaking, I didn't want to become a panel member. The Kantei (Prime Minister's Official Residence) would present four types of situations, such as a US warship navigating alongside an SDF vessel being attacked. And what if I said, "The definition of the right to collective self-defense is absurd?" That would cause trouble for other members. Discussing restrictions something like a

TOKYO 00002233 003 OF 010

government statement would also be difficult. But now, I'm curious to hear other people's arguments.

(3) Laughing at constitutional protectionists' strange logic

SANKEI (Page 15) (Full)
May 15, 2007

Toshiyuki Shikata, professor at Teikyo University

A national referendum bill got through the Diet yesterday, and Japan has now taken a step forward toward amending its postwar constitution. However, I was always irritated whenever I heard the opinions of constitutional protectionists. Many of them are opposed to bilateral defense cooperation between Japan and the United States. They insist that Japan should distance itself from the United States and should act on its own. However, they say it's taboo to advocate establishing a constitution on Japan's own. That's quite absurd. They also assert that the Constitution of Japan-even though the strategic environment changes-must not be amended because its ideas are lofty.

To take a look at the written constitutions of major countries, the United States has upheld its constitution as is for the longest period of time, though with amendments. That is because the United States created its constitution on its own and has seen no change in its establishment.

In the meantime, Marxism-Leninism, which once dominated the world, was the spirit of many communist nations' respective constitutions. In the changing times, however, almost all of their constitutions were amended. Their constitutions were modeled after the now-defunct Soviet Union's constitution, which was revised in 1993 and became Russia's new constitution. Even a constitution accepted by the people of a country when established is revised later with the changes of the times, as a matter of fact in history. The Constitution of Japan today came to us from the Occupation forces, and it came into effect with minor changes that Japan had begged for and the Occupation forces had allowed. Therefore, it's only natural to review this postwar constitution at some point.

Meanwhile, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party was also too negligent. To recount the delay in constitutional revision, the LDP first said the time was not ripe. Next, the LDP said Japan has obtained something substantial with its interpretation. So saying, the LDP did not work to find the right time for constitutional revision. Prime Minister Abe, who is young, became the first LDP president to come into power under the slogan of constitutional revision.

Japan created the Self-Defense Forces, and today, sends SDF personnel overseas to engage in United Nations peacekeeping

operations and in humanitarian and reconstruction assistance. These facts are the results of reinterpreting Japan's postwar constitution. The LDP has said the SDF is not a military force because the Constitution rules out the right of belligerency.

However, the SDF is an armed force of military troops in itself to any eye-not only to the eyes of the Japanese people but also to the eyes of the peoples of Japan's neighbors. We may well say a military force is a military force. This is not to blame in itself. There are some people refusing to call a military force a military force. That is to blame. I cannot think at all that the international community

TOKYO 00002233 004 OF 010

will recommend such a strange country to be seated on the United Nations Security Council as its permanent member.

There is one more thing that I think is strange. Japan and the United States teamed up to impose economic sanctions on North Korea. In the six-party talks, however, the United States unilaterally relaxed its economic sanctions on North Korea and did not touch on that country's potential nuclear arsenal. Instead, the United States is poised to focus its efforts solely on stopping the North from developing nukes from now on.

There are some people taking it as the United States' shrewd stand that runs counter to the policy of strengthening the Japan-US alliance. However, the United States eyes settling the Iraq problem, blocking Iraq's nuclear development, and reunifying the Korean Peninsula. Ultimately, the United States has its relationship with China in mind. As part of such a global-scale grand strategy, the United States is only dealing with the issue of North Korea's nuclear arsenal.

In the meantime, North Korea is said to have 200 intermediate-range ballistic missiles, which can reach any of Japan's big cities in 10 minutes or so. As it stands, Japan will have to intercept them within several minutes. For Japan, North Korea's nuclear arsenal is of a tactical nature that quite differs from that of the United States.

Prime Minister Abe called the Japan-US alliance "irreplaceable." Even so, the United States takes several strategic and tactical counteractions, giving first consideration to its national interests. I take it for granted, and it is no wonder, that the United States does so.

Similarly, Japan is also a country that will not try to do all it can to protect the United States' national interests. An alliance displays its power only when a country and another under that alliance almost concur in their respective interests. That is the limit of an alliance and the way realpolitik is in the world.

Japan has depended on the United States' nuclear umbrella and has done nothing to provide against a nuclear attack. Japan has upheld its self-imposed three nonnuclear principles and has not legislated even for the capability of striking enemy bases. Lately, the government only began at long last to lay down a missile defense system and restudy exercising the right of collective self-defense.

The United States provides its nuclear umbrella to Japan. Even so, there are some cases where we cannot find it effective to have a nuclear counterattack launched at once. Japan therefore should not spare its multifarious efforts to heighten its reliability. Japan should reduce its three nonnuclear principles to two. At the same time, Japan should immediately build early-warning systems against ballistic missiles and should also hurry to acquire the capability of striking enemy bases.

Many of those constitutional protectionists espouse a Japan acting on its own. On the other hand, they believe that Japan is secure under the US nuclear umbrella. They have such a strange way of thinking. If they reject the US nuclear umbrella, there are only three options left. First, Japan closes its eyes to a nuclear arsenal and risk exposing the nation to a defenseless state. Second, Japan enters the nuclear umbrella of China or Russia. And third, Japan possesses its own nuclear weapons. All these options are

unrealistic.

In the end, many of the constitutional protectionists-when it comes to the nuclear problem-are in the habit of insisting on the necessity of eliminating nuclear weapons and trying to escape from reality. Idealism must depart from reality.

(4) Feature: Prime Minister Abe's words and action regarding the issue of his providing offering to Yasukuni Shrine

MAINICHI (Page 4) (Slightly abridged)
Eve., May 10, 2007

Yasuyoshi Nojima, Arisa Ota

It became known recently that Prime Minister Shinzo Abe had sent an offering of a "sakaki tree" (valued at 50,000 yen) to Yasukuni Shrine for its spring festival (on April 21-23). But when asked about this by reporters, Abe said to them, "I refuse to answer that question." Even when further pressed to answer, he made this comment: "I hope the public will understand that."

Main points of questions and answers exchanged between Abe and reporters

The following are main points of Abe's remarks made on the night of April 8 in response to questions posed by reporters about whether he sent an offering to Yasukuni Shrine.

-- With what feelings did you send an offering to the shrine?

Abe: I want to keep on showing respect for those who fought for our country and died, and to pray for their souls.

-- Did you send an offering, instead of visiting the shrine?

Abe: Now that matters related to Yasukuni Shrine have become political and diplomatic issues, I decline to comment on whether I will visit the shrine or whether I sent the offering.

-- Do you mean to say you deny the fact that you had sent an offering?

Abe: I decline to comment on this question, either, as well as the question of whether to send it or not.

-- Is that because if you make it clear, there may be an impact on relations with other countries?

Abe: I've already made clear my standpoint.

-- It's impossible to hide the fact that you sent an offering, isn't it?

Abe: I don't deny it. I simply refuse to either confirm or deny it.

-- Don't you think your attitude encourages a certain religious activity?

Abe: I've already made clear my standpoint.

-- China and South Korea have voiced concerns.

Abe: I refuse to answer that sort of question, because if I do, my answer could give rise to a diplomatic issue.

-- Do you think your attitude will win the public's understanding?

Abe: I'd like to see the public, based on what I've said, understand my attitude.

Comments by Ritsumeikan University Prof. Shoji Azuma: Abe evasive

It is just like Abe to say "I decline to comment on whether I had sent an offering." It is also characteristic of Japanese politicians to comment in a way in which they evade, dodge or parry a question. Abe follows this sort of old-style political tradition.

Abe often uses polite sentences ending with the polite verb, "gozaimasu," just as traditional politicians used to do. But this way of speaking has a bureaucratic flavor and gives an impression of his being subservient. Former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi, who never used such polite endings, always spoke in a clear and firm manner. Compared to Koizumi, Abe's way of speaking seems ambiguous.

Abe appears to be speaking to the public with sincerity, and this attitude is understandable. But his way of speaking gives the impression that he lacks self-confidence and the strength required of politicians. His speeches fail to come home to us.

Why is this so? It is because Abe speaks like reporters setting out facts in an unconcerned manner. In this sense, he is in sharp contract to US Senator Barack Obama, who is winning popularity as a likely candidate for the next US presidential election. Obama often stresses this in his speeches: "This election is not mine but yours." He can employ words that come home to voters. Therefore, his popularity is going up.

Politicians need to place emphasis on expressing their real feelings so as to deeply resonate with the public. This tendency is found around the world. What Japanese voters seek from politicians is also changing. Politicians are required to show a sense of fellowship and demonstrate a strong leadership. One example of this is the magnetism and strength of former Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka. Abe lacks both.

When trouble occurs, politicians tend to take either of the two approaches: one is to face up to the problem and then resolve it; and the other to sidestep the problem and behave as if nothing happened. In most cases, Abe apparently has taken the latter course.

This behavior of Abe can be politically called "avoidance strategy." In other words, it is an evasive strategy. This strategy is very common in Asia, but it is not acceptable in the United States. As his recent remarks on the wartime "comfort women" issue caused the American public to become aroused, Abe's way of speaking could be taken as "lying." Even if he makes efforts sincerely, the leader of a country is required to do more.

Shoji Azuma: Born in Ishikawa Prefecture in 1956; graduated from Waseda University's School of Letters; serves as professor of the Language Education & Information Science of the Graduate School at Ritsumeikan University and also as professor of Language & Literature at Utah University

TOKYO 00002233 007 OF 010

Comments by journalist Shoko Egawa: Abe's remark "Private capacity" logic-chopping; He shouldn't take office as "prime minister" if he is unwilling to fulfill accountability

I wonder which country Prime Minister Abe represents? I am concerned about Abe's lack of explanation to the public about the question of whether he had sent an offering to Yasukuni Shrine rather than that question itself.

When it comes to the wartime "comfort women" issue, Abe said that there was no coercion by the former Imperial Japanese Army. This remark caused a controversy afterwards, but Abe failed to give a proper account about that to Japanese media, as well as to the Diet. Nonetheless, he was energetic about explaining it to President Bush, US lawmakers, and US media. Why didn't he do the same to Japanese journalists? I suspect that he thinks it is unnecessary to give an appropriate explanation to the Japanese public.

I also suspect that he might have thought that his offering of a sakaki tree (priced at 50,000 yen) to Yasukuni Shrine was not a problem unless it was openly revealed to the public. If so, it would be unavoidable that what he is doing behind the scenes comes into public scrutiny. I am worried that other countries may consider Japan to be distrustful because of its top political leader's furtive behavior.

Abe sent an offering to Yasukuni Shrine in the capacity of prime minister, didn't he? For the shrine, his title had a meaning, but Abe insisted that he did so as a private citizen. This is logic-chopping. Instead of explaining with his own words about this matter, Abe had the chief cabinet secretary explain it. Abe himself should explain with his own words.

Politicians are supposed to bear a responsibility to do their best to explain things with their own words and persuade the public. However, (former Prime Minister) Koizumi got by with only one-phrase quips. In the case of the offering of a sakaki tree this time, Abe has refused to say anything, not even a one-phrase comment. It's deplorable. I wonder whether politicians have deteriorated that far. If he is unwilling to fulfill his accountability, he should not take office as prime minister. He should pay a visit or send an offering to Yasukuni Shrine as a private citizen, Shinzo Abe coming from Yamaguchi Prefecture, if he wants to do so.

He has stated, "I refuse to say anything about the matter because this sort of thing has become a diplomatic and political issue." This means that he is aware that his behavior could create a diplomatic issue. If so, he should give a proper explanation, like his personal feelings that led to the offering, his position and his diplomatic consideration. This is the starting point of debate on the matter. If he thinks debating is unnecessary, that is a denial of democracy.

Or does he think that if we the Japanese want a proper explanation from the Japanese prime minister, the first thing for us to do is to appeal to US lawmakers and journalists and ask them to have the prime minister explain? This is too sad a situation, isn't it?

Shoko Egawa: Born in 1958; after working as a reporter of the Kanagawa Shimbun, became a free-lance journalist; is the author of many books; and was awarded the Kikuchi Kan Prize for her series of reporting on the Aum Shinrikyo cult.

TOKYO 00002233 008 OF 010

(5) One year after Japan-US agreement on Futenma relocation plan

YOMIURI (Page 13) (Abridged slightly)
May 17, 2007

By Yoshifumi Sugita, Political News Department

Will the plan to relocate the US Marine Corps' Futenma Air Station (in Ginowan, Okinawa Prefecture) move forward now that the Japan-US defense chiefs have met in Washington, following the Upper House Okinawa by-election in April in which the ruling coalition-backed candidate was victorious?

"It's important to implement the plan as is without making any changes."

This comment came from US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates at the outset of his meeting with Defense Minister Fumio Kyuma in Washington on April 30. Gates apparently intended to dampen the emerging moves to alter the Futenma relocation plan. On his way home, Kyuma stopped over in Brussels where he continued to hint at modifying the plan, saying: "Even if we make no major changes to the current plan, we still won't know if the United States is against shifting (the envisaged runways)."

Tokyo and Washington agreed last May on a plan to build a V-shaped pair of runways on the coastline of Camp Schwab (in Nago) to relocate Futenma Air Station. But no progress has been made since then. The reason is because LDP-backed Hirokazu Nakaima won the

Okinawa gubernatorial race last November, pledging to: (1) revise the government's plan, and (2) eliminate the dangerous nature of Futenma Air Station within three years. In addition, Okinawa had a by-election for the Upper House this April.

The Futenma relocation council, which consists of representatives of the central, prefectural, and municipal governments, has not met since this January. The government's plan to send in March a set of documents on environment assessment methods to the prefectural government has also been stalled.

Will the Japan-US agreement become reality with coalition-backed Aiko Shimajiri's victory in the Upper House by-election?

On April 25, three days after the by-election, Kyuma told Gov. Nakaima: "We can now push ahead with the survey of existing conditions smoothly. Let us consult with each other closely in a businesslike manner before presenting the environmental impact assessment documents." Kyuma's comment followed a report to him that Nakaima would agree to the survey of existing conditions to be conducted independently by the government ahead of the environmental impact assessment.

Although Gov. Nakaima has been lobbying the government to bring about his campaign pledges since taking office, talks with the government always broke off due to objections from Defense Ministry administrative officials. Against all odds, Kyuma takes a flexible stance toward revising the plan, as seen in his comment: "Any runway will do as long as it is acceptable to Washington, the affected municipalities, and Tokyo." Nakaima's recent cooperative posture is apparently ascribable to Kyuma's consideration to Okinawa.

His consideration reflects the fact that under current law, landfills for airfield construction requires the governor's

TOKYO 00002233 009 OF 010

authorization. Legally speaking, Futenma Air Station cannot be relocated unless the governor authorizes landfills once the environmental impact assessment is over.

The government intends to push the relocation issue forward by obtaining Okinawa's concurrence before long about presenting environmental assessment methods and resuming Futenma relocation council meeting. In late April, Kyuma told Nakaima: "You don't have to do anything. There is ample time before authorizing (landfills). Until then, let's find a settlement line."

Base issues have repeatedly been put off because of elections. This year, the Upper House election is coming up in July. Some in the government and the ruling coalition are already calling for shelving the Futenma plan in deference to Okinawa residents and their sensitivity to base issues. But the situation is such that the government will have to mobilize Maritime Self-Defense personnel for setting up equipment for the survey of existing conditions at the cost of Okinawa's sentiments.

What is Kyuma's settlement line? Uncertainties are looming over the Futenma relocation plan.

(6) Japan being downgraded with 29-year-old woman named director for Asian Affairs at White House NSC

SHUKAN BUNSHUN (Page 52) (Full)
May 24, 2007

"It must be a mistake. I wonder if Japan is being downplayed, " a senior Foreign Ministry official reportedly said when he received a cable from the Japanese Embassy in Washington informing him of the appointment of the new director for Japan and Korea at the National Security Council (NSC).

The Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau, which is in charge of policy toward the US, and the Asian and Oceanian Affairs Bureau, which is responsible for Korean Peninsula policy, had been paying attention to who would succeed Victor Cha, after the scholar returned late last month to his former teaching position at

Georgetown University.

An international journalist said:

"Cha, a Korean American, is a specialist in East Asian affairs. His predecessor, Michael Green, currently Japan Chair and senior advisor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) is a Japan expert who speaks fluent Japanese. Green has quite a few acquaintances in Japan's political, government and academic circles. So, the post of director for Japan and Korea at the NSC has always been served by experts on Japanese or Korean affairs."

However, the person who was appointed as new NSC director for Japan and Korea was 29-year-old Katrin Fraser. "They must be kidding!" someone said.

Fraser graduated from the Fletcher School at Tufts University in 2001 and entered the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). After serving three years in Seoul, South Korea, she worked as an analyst for East Asian affairs at CIA headquarters. After that, moving to the State Department, she had served as special aide to the assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs.

TOKYO 00002233 010 OF 010

The international journalist commented:

"It is true that she is a former CIA officer with a high scholastic standing. Since she lived in Japan when she was a child, she speaks a little Japanese. She is fluent in Korean. However, it is another problem whether she is suitable to serve in the post responsible for East Asia policy."

In fact, Fraser will not assume the post of deputy US envoy to the six-party talks on the North Korean nuclear issue, although her predecessor Cha had served in that post. The White House seems to have known that she lacks ability to serve in that capacity. Some say that her appointment is evidence of the Bush administration becoming a lame duck.

Fraser's Japanese counterparts are North American Affairs Bureau Director General Shinichi Nishimiya and Asian and Oceanian Affairs Bureau Director General Kenichiro Sasae.

"Both Nishimiya and Sasae are in their mid-fifties. So the age gap alone between Fraser and them is enormous," the journalist said.

SCHIEFFER